

on May 14, 2002. These comments are repeated here with the added comment that "The claimed subject matter, not the specification, is the measure of invention. Limitations in the specification cannot be read into the claims for the purpose of avoiding the prior art." But the replies to the examiner's comments made in the last noted Response were not made to distinguish over prior art; they were made to address the issue under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. The replies were submitted to show that the functions recited in the claims were supported by structure in the claims and not just the specification.

It is respectfully submitted that the replies submitted should be given there proper consideration and not dismissed out of hand by repeating the rejections and advancing the presumed allegation that the replies are directed to structure in the specification and not the claims. How do the replies given fail to address the issue of indefiniteness? The examiner never reveals why. For example, in reply to the comment that "no means for loading or unloading the substrates has been set forth" it was noted that "the substrates 11 are shown as mounted in the transport box 13 which in turn moves on the roller track 75. The transport box 13 can be moved manually, if desired, through the lock opening 46 into the clean room once the roller track is moved to the opening by the receiving table 45, the latter being brought into engagement with the wall 40, and from the clean room back out onto the roller track 75.." Note that the structure here discussed: the transport box, the roller track, the lock opening and the receiving table, are all claimed in the pending claims. Why is this reply not sufficient in explaining that there are means for loading and unloading recited?

(2)


In traversing the rejection under 35 USC 103(a), applicants noted in the Response

filed on May 14, 2002, that the combination of Bonora et al and Huang et al fail to disclose "an adapter device as defined in the claims. Such a device must be located between the processing installation and the lock device, it must be held on the processing installation for adjustment relative thereto, and it must releasably fastened thereto the lock device." In response to this assertion, the examiner states "Further, re the 'Remarks' concerning Bonora et al's claim 1, the instant Examiner cannot be responsible for the actions of others." What does this even mean. Applicants havn't a clue on how to respond to this statement or what its relevance is.

By making these rejections final, the examiner has forced applicant to refile this application under 37 CFR 1.114 as an RCE so that clarification can be provided .

It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the Response filed May 14, 2002 should be properly reconsidered and prosecution of this application reopened without requiring applicants to file the accompanying RCE. The filing fee for the RCE should be refunded.

Respectfully submitted,



Felix J. D'Ambrosio
Reg. No. 25,721

March 10, 2003

P.O. Box 2266 Eads Station
Arlington, VA 22202
Tel: (703) 415-1500
Fax: (703) 415-1508